



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,014	12/14/2000	Ahmed Fattah	JA999-711	8231
877	7590	01/24/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER P.O. BOX 218 YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598			VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/737,014

Applicant(s)

FATTAH ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attach.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-10, 12-21, 25-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/04/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive to overcome the prior art.

**1.Finality of the Office Action:**

Applicant argues the final office action is not appropriate.

Examiner points out the First Office Action and the Final rejection applied the same prior art (Goldsmith-Gupta references). There was no changed ground for rejection. See MPEP § 609 paragraph (B) (2). MPEP § 706.07(a).

**2.Rejection of Claims 1-10,12-21,25-26:**

Applicant argues the prior art does not teach or suggest

(1) the instantiation of both business object and service objects in a client computer system;

(2) the association of business objects with a service objects transport to the server.

Examiner points out the prior art taught

(1) instantiating a transactional object on the client that directly corresponds to a service request [Goldsmith, sub-objects, col 5 lines 15-32; a client-server system using object-oriented program includes application program (i.e.: business objects or application framework for commercial) invoking, transporting and responding RPC

Art Unit: 2142

service request (i.e.: service objects), col 9 lines 29-10 line 45, Fig 6; the CSF interface objects comprise another remote stream object (i.e.: a business object) and a protocol translator object (i.e.: a service object), col 16 lines 35-62, data object, col 20 lines 3-7].

It was clearly that by instantiating the CSF objects which includes the instantiation of another remote stream object (i.e.: a business object) and a protocol translator object (i.e.: a service object).

(2) transporting said object to a server [Goldsmith, transport to server node, col 10 lines 45-52; col 11 lines 17-27; col 46-62].

Thus, the rejection is sustained.

**Thong Vu**  
**Patent Examiner**  
**Art Unit 2142**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thong Vu', with a horizontal line underneath it.